



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|

10/593,715

09/21/2006

Masataka Tamura

06125

3116

23338 7590 06/01/2009
DENNISON, SCHULTZ & MACDONALD
1727 KING STREET
SUITE 105
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER

FRANCIS, FAYE

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3725

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

06/01/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | | |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. 10/593,715 | Applicant(s) TAMURA ET AL. |
| | Examiner Faye Francis | Art Unit 3725 |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 September 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>9/21/06</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: on page 2 second paragraph, referring back to reference 1 is not proper (what is reference 1).

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
4. The claims are generally narrative and indefinite, failing to conform with current U.S. practice. They appear to be a literal translation into English from a foreign document and are replete with grammatical and idiomatic errors. For example **only**, the phrase “at least one blade projected from a face thereof opposed to each other and formed with a through hole penetrated in the axial direction and a position proximate to a rotational axis center of the rotating disk and at a position of at least one section thereof in a circumferential direction” in lines 7-12 from the bottom of claim 1, render the claims indefinite because all of the particular features encompassed thereby cannot be determined. Note also phrase “a crushing operation produced in accordance with driving to rotate the blade” in lines 4-5 from bottom of claim 1.

Art Unit: 3725

Claims 2-3 and 10 are indefinite since all that the applicant considers to be encompassed by the entire claims cannot be determined. For example, what has been adjusted?

Claim 4 is indefinite because it is not clear what the phrase “a guide projection having a shape of guiding the powder flowing from an upstream side to a downstream side along the peripheral wall face from the peripheral wall face to an inner side” is intended to encompass.

Claim 6 is indefinite since all that the applicant considers to be encompassed by the phrase “at least one impact blade having a shape of facing a peripheral wall face disposed on an outer side in a radius direction of a disk face on a side of the discharging section thereof at the disk face on the side of the discharging section” cannot be determined.

With respect to claim 7, the last 7 lines are confusing.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by either JP 2003-71307 or JP 05-220375 or JP 08-60578.

The claims are interpreted as best understood by the examiner. The claims are interpreted as requiring a supply section, a crushing section including two rotating disks

Art Unit: 3725

(see the Figs). Either JP 2003-71307 or JP 05-220375 or JP 08-60578 is considered to clearly show a device having the structural elements of the claims that can be understood.

7. Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipate by either Hopkins (2,270,946) or Kelsey (US 2002/0088882) or Rohrbach (4,087,052).

The claims are interpreted as best understood by the examiner. The claims are interpreted as requiring a supply section, a crushing section including two rotating disks (see the Figs). Either Hopkins or Kelsey or Rohrbach is considered to clearly show a device having the structural elements of the claims that can be understood.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Faye Francis whose telephone number is 571-272-4423. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dana Ross can be reached on 571-272-4480. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3725

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Faye Francis/
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3725

FF